



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of modern criticism has led him to overlook some useful contributions which the ordinary reader might be glad to see noticed, particularly those of Halévy and Chajes. Thus, to give only one instance, the latter conjectures plausibly that *ἐν σαββάτῳ* (24:20) means the sabbatical year when, owing to the absence of agriculture (Lev. 25:6), food would be scarce (cf. vs. 7); while Halévy² argues that the Aramaic original כְּסִיחָא (= *χαιμῶνος*) was miswritten כְּשַׁבְחָא by a scribe (= *ἐν σαββάτῳ*), Matthew adding the *μηδέ*. Numerous suggestions of this kind have been made, and a sifted discussion of them would have been at least more relevant than the interminable quotation of synoptic parallels, which is food neither for man nor for beast. Mr Allen has wisely remembered that his readers will have access to a dictionary of the Bible and a grammar, but he has forgotten that they also may be presumed to possess a synopsis in Greek or English. To say this is to end as I began, with the somewhat ungracious note of complaint. Yet what can one do? The sheer merits of the book only sharpen one's sense of disappointment with the voluntary humility which has beguiled the writer to do less than justice to himself, his subject, and his readers. As one of Terence's characters observes, *nec nihil est nec omnia quae iste dicit*. Mr. Allen has certainly said something of value on his topic, a scholar of his caliber could hardly fail to do so. But he has prevented himself from saying more; partly owing to its formal defect, the book is lacking in breadth of outlook and religious penetration. Hence he has obliged even his most grateful readers to admit that this edition, while marking a distinct advance upon any English work, cannot be described by any means as a final commentary upon our first gospel. It is, however, a good book for the advanced student to work with. Sound labor has gone to the making of it, and the very sense of problems in the gospel which it leaves on the mind of the reader will be stimulating, if not satisfying.

JAMES MOFFATT

BROUGHTY FERRY, SCOTLAND

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS THEOLOGY

THE RELATION OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS TO ONE ANOTHER

It is the conviction of Dr. Adolf Müller¹ that the canonical Gospel of Mark cannot be a source for Matthew and Luke. In that opinion he finds himself established, in large part, by the results of the studies of

² *Revue sémitique* (1900), pp. 145 f.

¹ *Geschichtskerne in den Evangelien nach modernen Forschungen: Marcus und Matthäus*. Von Adolf Müller. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1905. xi+144 pages. M. 3.

Wrede² and Weiss.³ Dr. Müller does not attempt an original analysis of the material in Mark, but devotes liberal space to setting forth successively the conclusions of Wernle,⁴ Wrede, and J. Weiss, on the basis of which he decides that definite results in the estimate of the individual character of the Second Gospel are not easily attainable. This lack of unanimity is to be charged, he believes, to the fact that recognition enough has not been given to the indications that Mark is not a unified work from one hand and with, as a consequence, one standpoint. It is not true, for instance, that Mark pictures the personality of Jesus as less supernatural than does Matthew, for witness the Markan narratives of the baptism, the temptation, and the miracles. Confusion is lessened if the canonical Gospel of Mark be regarded to have passed through stages in its history. Perhaps it may be held that John Mark narrated his recollections of Peter's story of Jesus' life in Aramaic. This formed the groundwork for the canonical gospel; the latter was composed in Rome by translating the Aramaic, supplementing the narrative, and adapting the whole to ends to be served in the Graeco-Roman Christian community. John Mark no doubt came under the influence of Paul.

It is mainly in his treatment of Matthew that Dr. Müller reveals the purpose of his review of Mark and states critical conclusions on phases of the synoptic problem that are more or less original with him. The canonical Matthew cannot be regarded as the product of one hand, for within it the limited and the broad outlook, the legal and the spiritual attitude, Jewish only and world-wide sympathies, find expression. There is thus presented the problem of distinguishing the strata in the material of the First Gospel. What shall be the standard? Most naturally that should be regarded as original which expresses the standpoint of monotheistic Jewish Christianity (Matt. 5 : 23; 17 : 24-27; 23 : 2 f.) in the simplest form (Matt. 10 : 5; 6 : 23; 15 : 24; 19 : 23; 23 : 3). Expansions and additions to an original narrative will then be found where conditions in the time of Jesus are presupposed that do not correspond to the beginnings of the Christian community but belong to a later stage in the development. Judged by these standards, Matthew does not yield evidence to support the customary theory of two sources, one narrative (Mark) and the other discourse (Logia). Rather is it true that in the underlying source of the first gospel both kinds of material were mixed. This is evidenced further by the consideration that the discourses when wrenched from their narrative framework lose much of their intelligibility and force. On the testi-

² Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, 1901.

³ J. Weiss, *Das älteste Evangelium*, 1903. ⁴ Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage*, 1899.

mony of Papias we learn of an original Gospel of Matthew; its characteristic probably was that it preponderantly contained sayings of Jesus imbedded in historical situations or framed within narratives. Alongside this original Aramaic Matthew, and not improbably underlying it, there was current the Aramaic gospel by John Mark which ultimately by additions and alterations became the canonical Mark. The Aramaic Matthew contained almost all the narratives and discourses now in Mark. Of the discourses now in Matthew, it is to be held that probably they were not found in the places and in the form that they exhibit in the canonical Matthew; the order and composition is to be traced to the redactor of the Aramaic Matthew. The traditional Logia source for Matthew seems to Dr. Müller to be an illusory fog, for the oriental, who delights in narrative, could with difficulty retain and transmit abstract discourses. While the canonical Mark may early have taken its form for the western church, in the East new portions, especially of discourses, were added to the Aramaic ground material of the narratives, and the whole translated for Greek-Jewish Christians and circulated in their circles in the second century. Upon this enlarged gospel the redactor worked changes and additions, the result being the canonical Matthew, a gospel representing the ecclesiastical standpoint of the time.

In the canonical Gospel of Mark Dr. Wendling⁵ believes that there are to be distinguished three strata of material: M¹=Short, pithy, instructive sayings of Jesus in a scant but perspicuous framework of narrative; M²=Narratives of the miracles of Jesus in circumstantial, in part poetically enlarged, delineation; Ev=Enlargements by the redactor or evangelist, dominated by dogmatic theories and, so far as they contain narratives, in tedious, obscure form. Such is the result; more important is the process and the question of its validity. A fixed basis for operations is found in sections of Mark which it is believed can with certainty be referred to the redactor. In them his mode of work and literary characteristics are observed; the standards thus obtained are utilized to trace the same hand in other portions. Especially notable is the encroachment of the redactor in the chapter of parables (Mark 4:1-34). The old plain narrative of how Jesus, sitting in a boat, spake parables to the people is enlarged to a striking, extensive composition through another scene (pp. 10 ff.), in which a narrow circle of disciples is instructed concerning these parables. This scene is not united with the original scene organically, but is inserted mechanically, so that the word-order of the old text is respected throughout. The redactor

⁵ *Ur-Marcus. Versuch einer Wiederherstellung der ältesten Mitteilungen über das Leben Jesu.* Von Emil Wendling. Tübingen; Mohr, 1905. 73 pages. M. 1.50.

goes on the theory that the parables were meant in a mystical-allegorical sense. A second important interpolation is Mark 3:22-30; here also an old, simple narrative (3:20-21 + 31-35) is split in two parts, and a situation, otherwise clear throughout, is made complex and obscure through the insertion of a new scene. The content of the insertion consists of sayings which, as testified by Matthew and Luke, stood in the Logia source. This suggests the conjecture that similar series of sayings, which for the most part have an inadequate framework of narrative, found a place in the Marcan narrative first through the redactor. Of this nature are the sayings in Mark 6:7-11; 8:34-9:1; 9:40-50; 10:42-45; 11:23-25; 12:38-40; 13:9-13. Some preliminary support for the theory of interpolation is found in the mechanical mold of the introduction, "and he called unto them," in Mark 3:23; 6:7; 8:34; 10:42; 12:43. Dr. Wendling now presses boldly forward to advance arguments in favor of considering other passages also as interpolations, and, on the basis of the discernible characteristics of the two original narrators and the redactor, the analysis of the gospel is carried through to completion. The results are exhibited by printing the Greek text of Mark in two parts, the first showing M¹ and M² together but in different styles of type, the second containing the interpolations by the evangelist. The latter make about two-fifths of the volume of the gospel. Of the original narrative, about five-ninths is assigned to M¹.

In the "Jowett Lectures" for 1906, repeated by Professor Burkitt as his inaugural course at Cambridge University,⁶ he endeavored less to formulate original theories on the origin of the Gospels than to indicate his attitude toward notions on the subject already the possession of scholars; less to arrest the attention of his fellow-workers in the field than to inform the mind and stimulate the thought of that considerable body of interested Christians whose studies have not necessarily made them familiar with present-day movements in gospel criticism. Yet it is not alone in taking account of the comprehensive, orderly, and suggestive treatment of the chosen theme that the critical reader will have satisfaction; in many portions of the work there will be found strikingly original opinions of greater or lesser scope and significance. It is a book to put into the hands of the non-specialist who desires to know something of what scholars are thinking about the Gospels; yet it is not without its measure of service to one who already has done much reading and reflection on the subject.

⁶ *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. By F. Crawford Burkitt. Edinburgh: Clark; New York: Scribner, 1906. viii + 360 pages. \$2.00 net.

Critical work upon the Gospels is justified thus:

It is not to get new ideas of religion or of philosophy that we need a minute and searching historical criticism; rather do we need to test the ideas we already have by the historical facts, and we cannot get at the facts without the criticism. . . . The attempt to "return to the historic Christ" is the only way by which we can escape from the tyranny of the last generation's theories about Christ.

A critical beginning may be had in "the one solid contribution made by the scholarship of the nineteenth century toward the solution of the synoptic problem," namely, that Mark was one of the sources used by Matthew and Luke. No irresistible argument is found for an Ur-Marcus; Mark is not itself based on older literary sources; in one instance only may a written source underlie the Second Gospel, that is, the eschatological discourse (Mark 13:3-37) may have circulated independently as a flysheet. Subjected to the closest scrutiny and most trying tests, Mark conveys the impression still of general historical trustworthiness. What shall be said of Matthew and Luke in this regard? Luke and Acts were surely written by Luke the physician and companion of Paul, probably in his old age, say about 100 A. D. For the former he used Mark and another source; within the latter he incorporated his own diary of travels, the "We-sections," freely recasting. Since he used Mark as the main source for the gospel history, it seems unlikely that he had had much personal intercourse with those who had been the companions of the ministry of Jesus. The author of Matthew is unknown to us; the "Logia" of Papias perhaps was a collection of messianic proof-texts from the Hebrew Bible made by the apostle Matthew; since many of these are embodied in the First Gospel in such form as to indicate their Hebrew source, it may be conjectured that it was by this use that the name of Matthew became attached to the gospel. "Matthew and Luke give us an interpretation of Jesus Christ's life. An interpretation may be helpful, illuminating, even inspired, but it remains an interpretation." There are grave difficulties in the way of considering the narratives of Peter walking on the water, Judas and the pieces of silver, the earthquake at the crucifixion, the guard at the tomb, as serious history.

Matthew greatly disturbed the order of Mark; Luke did not. Probably both treated the other source common to both in the same way. Therefore, if we would reconstruct that source (which Professor Burkitt would not designate as the Logia but, with Wellhausen, as Q) we must subtract from Luke the first two chapters and those sections simply derived from Mark; what is left will represent the approximate order and arrangement of the lost document. As an external test which will give us a general assurance that a saying is really from Jesus and not the half-conscious product of one

school of his followers, we may require the real double attestation that is had where the saying is reported in both Mark and Q.

The study of the Gospel of John is approached with the conviction that "if the history turn out to be no history, it must be because it was intended to teach something to the author more important than history." As for the external testimony to the traditional authorship, it is inconclusive. When internal tests are to be applied the criterion must be the gospel of Mark.

The fact is that the narrative in Mark and the narrative in John cannot be made to agree, except on the supposition that one or the other is, as regards the objective facts, inaccurate and misleading. . . . The evangelist was no historian: ideas, not events, were to him the true realities, and if we go to his work to learn the course of events we shall only be disappointed in our search.

One chapter is devoted to the careful exhibit of the individual characteristics of the First and Third Gospels. The final chapters take up in order the "Gospel Canon," "Marcion," and the "Rivals of the Canonical Gospels." The work closes with this word of commendation for the historical process:

The more we individualize the Figure of our Lord as manifested in action in that long past scene, the better we shall be able to embody the spirit of his teaching in forms appropriate to our own surroundings.

This statement of the view of these scholars suffices to show that the discussion of the problems presented by our Gospels is by no means nearing its conclusion. We are in the midst of the matter. But it is by such investigations and discussions as these that progress is made.

HENRY BURTON SHARMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

JESUS' CONCEPTION OF HIS NATURE AND MISSION

Professor H. J. Holtzmann's monograph on the self-consciousness of Jesus⁷ renders an important service in reviewing the situation and formulating what the author accepts as the present outcome of the discussion of this question. The necessity is strongly urged of keeping distinct the two elements in the problem, namely as to whether Jesus regarded himself as Messiah and, if so, in what sense he did this. With reference to the first point it is contended that if historical or exegetical doubt is held to exist in the case of many relevant passages this cannot be affirmed of Mark 14:62. All denial of Jesus' claim of messiahship is disproved by this confession and by the subsequent course of events. It is only in the light of Jesus' con-

⁷ *Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu: ein Beitrag zur Leben-Jesu-Forschung.* Von H. J. Holtzmann. Tübingen; Mohr, 1907. 100 pages. M. 2.60.

viction in this particular that the close of his life and the belief in his resurrection become comprehensible.

It remains to discover under what aspect he conceived of his messianic office. Possible uncertainty here will not, however, invalidate the point already established. The desired explanation is to be sought in the titles that Jesus applied to himself. Since there is so much uncertainty regarding the phrase Son of God as a self-designation, chief attention must be given to the title Son of man and the intricate problems connected therewith. The proper point of departure is not from philological considerations, which lead to no certain conclusions, nor from the two or three early passages in Mark, and parallels, where many think to find sufficient evidence to establish the equivalence of Son of man and man, but from the numerous passages following Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi, where the eschatological significance is unmistakable, e. g., Mark 14:62. While Matthew is self-contradictory, and its inconsistencies have given rise to much uncertainty regarding the title, Mark and the Lukan parallels show that it was derived from Dan. 7:13, and was first used by Jesus near the end of his life to express his conception of his messiahship. This finding of the Messiah in himself was not due to accommodation to his age, but to obedience to an inner compulsion. The gradual change from the third person to the first, regarded by Wellhausen as showing how the community gradually overcame its hesitation in using the title, can be transferred to the consciousness of Jesus himself. As is true respecting the Kingdom, so here out of the present, hidden, prophetic Messiah comes the future, ultimately openly proclaimed, apocalyptic Messiah. It is in the first of these conceptions, with its sense of the divine sonship, that Jesus' abiding significance is to be sought. The theocratic sonship of the second was only its temporal expression. Modern theology thus comes to distinguish what in Jesus' self-consciousness was undivided. It was the conception Son of man as the *Christus futurus* that made possible the union of the two.

That Holtzmann's treatment of his theme will be unacceptable to the representatives of the traditional theology, much as they may agree with many of his conclusions, is self-evident. It is not to them that he addresses himself (p. 1), but rather to those who would either deny, ignore, or belittle in Jesus' life the factor of his self-consciousness. Besides establishing its main proposition in a judicious and convincing manner, the book abounds in very pertinent criticisms of recent investigations, notably those of Wrede, Schweitzer, and Merx. There is throughout the monograph the wealth of reference to current literature that is usually found in the author's writings.

The last number in the *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*

for the year 1906 is by Dr. Erich Schaeder,⁸ professor of theology at Kiel, and bears the title "Jesus' Gospel and the Gospel Regarding Jesus." Did Jesus believe and teach about himself what others believed and taught about him? In opposition to the prevailing tendency to establish a difference between the real Jesus and the Jesus of the apostolic age, Schaeder seeks to prove that this does not exist. Jesus regarded and proclaimed himself as Messiah in the same sense as that in which he is presented by the writers of this later period. Once again we have to do with the question of messianic self-consciousness. The author's arguments are directed particularly against the views of Wrede and Wellhausen. The fact of Jesus' self-consciousness he undertakes to establish, entirely apart from the vexed questions regarding titles, by pointing to the unique power exercised by him in three realms: (1) over the souls of men, as seen in the forgiveness of sins; (2) over the superhuman, as seen in the control of demons; (3) over nature, as is seen in his mastery of its course. To complete the answer to Wrede an explanation must be found for Jesus' veiling his messiahship. In part it was for the old pedagogical reason so often adduced, but a profounder motive was his desire to win men for God's kingdom, so far as possible, before he should assume the judging function that was inseparable from his messianic office.

Against Wellhausen it is maintained that Mark does not contain a double picture of Jesus and, secondly, that through God's spirit Jesus had certain knowledge of his suffering, death, and resurrection. He was not a slave to the course of history, to men and their deeds. Wellhausen's error is in his dogmatism that excludes God as a factor in the situation.

A further important question relating to the present theme has recently found trenchant statement by Tröltsch. How can we speak of the absoluteness of Christianity when it is an historical product? The historical is dependent, conditioned, relative. The answer is that Jesus was not limited in his absoluteness, either actually or in his consciousness. There was no limitation to his moral absoluteness, and his seeming bondage to the natural course of events was really voluntary. What was true in both these particulars holds for his gospel. We have no apostolic gospel unless we have included therein the gospel of Jesus regarding himself.

In spite of their agreement at important points, the two monographs before us are as unlike in method and temper as they well could be. The

⁸ *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*. Herausgegeben von Dr. A. Schlatter and Dr. W. Lütgert. Zehnter Jahrgang 1906. Sechstes Heft: "Das Evangelium Jesu und das Evangelium von Jesus (nach den Synoptikern)." Von Dr. Erich Schaeder, Professor der Theologie in Kiel. Gütersloh; Bertelsmann, 1906. 64 pages. M. 1.

first really answers those whom it sets out to refute, whereas those aimed at by the arguments of the second would probably hardly feel that they had encountered any opposition, the reason being that the very premises that they call in question are tacitly assumed. There exists accordingly no common plane of meeting. Even if we cannot commend the method followed in this second work, it is an occasion of satisfaction to find both books reaching, by such different ways, conclusions that are so far in accord.

WARREN J. MOULTON

BANGOR, MAINE

The study of the Messianic Consciousness by Streatfeild in his *Self-Interpretation of Jecus*⁹ compels respect by reason of the conspicuous earnestness and sincerity of the author. He enters the lists not because of his confidence in his ability but because his conscience drives him to the defense, as he believes, of Christian faith in her last citadel. He has ample acquaintance with the literature of his subject and writes with candor and constant fairness to opposing opinion. The immediate aim of the book is "to support the belief that the language of self-assertion recorded in the gospels is, substantially, the language of Jesus himself." Our writer sees that the consistency of the unique portrait which the gospels delineate is the best evidence of its substantial correctness. He believes that the "destructive criticism" of the gospels has left as an irreducible minimum the fact that Jesus Christ claimed to be the Messiah and in a unique sense Son of God. His ultimate aim is to show that this self-assertion of Jesus presents to us the alternative that he was "either truly divine or not ideal man." We are confronted with "the dilemma that either Christ was God or that he had no right to speak about himself as he did." If Jesus be not the Christ of the creeds then he is no savior and without any real value for man. The book is fundamentally in error in two respects. The value of Jesus and his message to man is not determined precisely by his peculiar ontological relation to God. And further, the dilemma which the author proposes will not exhaust the possibilities in the light of an honest historical interpretation of the gospels.

J. W. BAILEY

OSHKOSH, WIS.

⁹ *The Self-Interpretation of Jesus Christ. A Study of the Messianic Consciousness as reflected in the Synoptics.* By Rev. G. S. Streatfeild, M. A. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1906. xv + 211 pages. \$1.25 net.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The first of the books here to be passed in review is Grafe's¹⁰ clear and charmingly written address tracing the process by which the Old Testament became a Christian book. Jesus' attitude is regarded rightly as both critical and conservative and wrongly as *durchaus naiv und ohne Reflexion*. While the early Christians in Palestine held in some sort to the law, Paul, in view of his religious experience, was obliged either to drop the Old Testament or to Christianize it. Choosing the latter course, and winning by dint of familiar exegetical devices a Christian book, he could then prove that Scripture itself pointed not to law but to faith as the religious norm, and that not in the statutes but in Christ, the end of the law, lay the ethical norm of love. After Paul, the ways diverge. For the author of Hebrews, with his perfect and imperfect, the use of the Old Testament is typological. Barnabas gives up history for allegory. Matthew and John find in the Scriptures mainly prophecy. It is an interesting lecture.

Thieme¹¹ writes in the interest of theological ethics. The present volume to be followed later by a second volume, is devoted largely to a study of the mind of Jesus from the point of view of his humility. The style is wooden and not always clear. To follow the argument one must keep in mind a distinction, worked out elsewhere but assumed here, between religious, altruistic, and ipsistic. The latter is the imperative but blameless attitude toward one's self in distinction from the egoistic (p. 32). Most cases of humility however fall into more than one of these groups, and the purely ipsistic rarely occurs. He states the distinction in characteristic style (p. 232): "Wir können aber die Niedergesinntheit, sofern sie auch abgesehen von religiösen und altruistischen Motiven in der Selbstbeurteilung und in der ihr entsprechenden sozialen Selbsteinordnung zur Niedrigkeit, statt zur Geltung des Selbst gewillt ist, als die ipsistische spezifizieren." After an examination of the words (chap. i), he passes to Jesus' exhortations to humility before God and in the estimate of self. The sayings about first and last, great and small, ruling and serving, humbling and exalting one's self are scrutinized with the result that religiously, humility consists in the will to bow before the divine will; altruistically, in the refusal to judge others; ipsistically, in the will not to exalt but to humble

¹⁰ *Das Urchristentum und das Alte Testament: Rede gehalten beim Antritt des Rektorates zu Bonn am 18. Oktober, 1906.* Von E. Grafe. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906. 48 pages. M. 1.

¹¹ *Die christliche Demut: Eine historische Untersuchung zur theologischen Ethik.* Erste Hälfte: "Wortgeschichte und die Demuth bei Jesus." Von K. Thieme. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1906. xvi + 258 pages. M. 5.60.

one's self, whether in the search after position, or wealth, or honorary titles. Here we learn that the little child is not an example of humility, but is a type of the small among the great. Whosoever wills to become great foregoes greatness by service. Greatness will take care of itself in the future kingdom (chap. ii). The next three chapters examine the humility of Jesus. On the religious-altruistic side, this is explained not as *Leutseligkeit*, the narrower meaning of Matt. 11:29 (chap. v), but as *Niedergesinntheit* evident in service. Service is not to be mistaken for ruling or for helping, but is to be understood, in sharp contrast with the future messianic lordship, as a serving in lowliness and weakness and suffering (chap. iv). On the religious-ipsistic side, there come to view Jesus' sense of power, his agency in revelation, forgiveness, and future judgment, a oneness with God involving sinlessness and apartness from men, but not equality with God. Humility here consists not in the renunciation of worldly power, but in the denial of equality with God. In summing up, Thieme notes that the altruistic humility is the most original element; it was not determined by a feeling of sinful lowliness, as is the case with other men.

Overlooking the niceness of the categories into which the concrete sayings of Jesus are put, we may agree with the main point of the discussion. Jesus, conscious of power, certain that the true value of himself will be recognized in that world where true estimates prevail, chooses to unite in sympathetic service with the people, the outcast, little ones, lowly, poor, oppressed, to the end that they too might share his indifference to this world of misplaced values and might rest content in lowly service, certain that they too would be recognized at their full value in the other world. The humility of Jesus, we might almost say, is that of the aristocrat by birth who becomes a democrat by choice.

Schettler,¹² a pupil of Deissmann, studies *διὰ Χριστοῦ* and its synonyms (33 in Paul, 21 elsewhere), along with *διὰ θεοῦ* (4 in Paul, 2 elsewhere) and *διὰ Πνεύματος* (7 in Paul, 7 elsewhere). *διὰ* with the genitive of a person indicates, as the Septuagint and Paul prove, causal agency, and the phrase "through Christ" points out the activity of the spiritual Christ as agent in creation and salvation, present and future, and as an influence in general, or specifically in the life of prayer or in the official legitimization of the apostle. Like the formula "in Christ," "through Christ" carries us into the deepest experiences of Paul. But unlike "in Christ" which is static, marking the region in which God's saving purpose operates, "through Christ" is dynamic, postulating an activity of Christ.

¹² *Die paulinische Formel, "Durch Christus."* Von A. Schettler. Tübingen: Mohr, 1907. viii + 82 pages. M. 2.40.

The discussion is methodical and in the main convincing. I am doubtful however at two points: (1) Schettler insists that "in Christ" and "through Christ" are to be sharply distinguished. Paul's usage does not in my judgment bear out the contention. (2) He holds that "in Christ" is static, "through Christ" alone dynamic. "When Paul uses this formula (i. e., διὰ Χριστοῦ) he intends to emphasize the activity of the heavenly Christ, while the formula 'in Christ' regards salvation as a state (*Zustand*) resulting from belonging to Christ, or more accurately from *unio mystica* with him" (pp. 72 f). But Christ's relation to the believer is scarcely passive in Paul. Both these difficulties are due to the full acceptance of the local interpretation of ἐν. And both difficulties are removed if we follow the natural hypothesis that ἐν and ἔχειν have their origin in the phrases expressing demoniac possession (e. g., Mark 1:23; 3:30). Control and power are suggested by ἐν as well as by διὰ, something not static but dynamic. Finally, I am in doubt whether "formula" be not too rigorous a word to use. Or are we soon to have "*Die paulinische Formel, εἰς Χριστόν*"?

Fiebig¹³ writes for the lay reader who has at his side the New Testament of Luther or Weizsäcker or Stage. In six clearly written chapters he notes: (1) that for early Christianity the meaning of the death of Jesus and of a redemption through his blood was clear; (2) that the phrase "redeemed by his blood" suggested to the primitive church the sacrificial cult; (3) that this cult was observed because God willed it so; that the main thing in the cult, the atonement through blood, was unintelligible for both the New Testament and the contemporary Judaism; (4) that Jesus had only the most general notion that his death somehow would be for the good of humanity, perhaps an offering desired by God; (5) that the cult and the interpretation of the death of Jesus derived from it are to be given up today, for we have no cult and the cult expresses no longer our personal and ethical religion; (6) that through the death of Jesus we learn that faith in God the Father solves all the problems of this life and is the victory which overcomes the world.

The book is disappointing. Had Fiebig read G. F. Moore's article on "Sacrifice" in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, he would have saved himself from many a misstatement. To mention only a few points: (1) He tells us that atonement through blood is the central point of the cult. But Heb. 9:22 qualifies with a σφεδόν. Indeed the sin-offering might in certain cases be met by an oblation. The scape-goat of the day of atonement is not technically a sacrifice. Furthermore, the whole ceremony, not the blood

¹³ *Jesu Blut, ein Geheimniss?* ("Lebensfragen," No. 14, herausgegeben von H. Weinl.) Von P. Fiebig. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906. 78 pages. M. 1. 20.

alone, had atoning value. (2) He admits that repentance has a little to do with the efficacy of the cult, but holds the objective act to be decisive. This however does scant justice to Yoma (e. g., 8:8) upon which he relies. (3) But the main difficulty lies in the fact that he forgets that for primitive Christianity the death of the Messiah was a heart-breaking problem, and that they found their interpretation not in the trespass-offering of Isa. 53:10 (which Fiebig takes literally) but in the *παῖς θεοῦ*. Attaching themselves to the current view that the sufferings and death of the righteous for the unrighteous had expiatory value, they looked on Jesus the Messiah as the Servant of God of Isaiah, chap. 53—a Christian, not a Jewish, combination, perhaps suggested by remembered utterances of Jesus (cf., p. 42). Paul in I Cor. 15:3 accepts this interpretation. Had Fiebig seen this, he would not have overlooked the significance of Rom. 5:7 ff., and Col. 1:24, nor would he have considered II Cor. 5:14 and John 10:11 as Greek-mystical. (4) Finally, Fiebig seems to feel no difference between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the rest of the New Testament. He admits that Paul applies sacrificial metaphors to himself and others (Phil. 3:17; Rom. 12:1), but it does not occur to him that the relatively infrequent references to the death of Christ as a sacrifice in Paul may be similarly explained. In Hebrews, the case is different. Perhaps for the first time, the meaning of the death of Christ in the light of the sacrificial system is studied. But here the mode is Alexandrian, and Paul did not write Hebrews.

Fiebig lost a golden opportunity to serve the lay reader. The New Testament as well as the modern world finds the death of Christ a problem, increasingly so as we see God through Christ. The New Testament lays stress on the vicarious sufferings and death of Christ as the righteous for the unrighteous. The latest interpreter, the Johannist, finds the life and death of Christ inseparable factors, for both are vicarious, a point impossible if the blood were all. The ethical interpretation reaches deeper than Fiebig has seen, for it is wrapped up not in the cult, but in the vicarious sufferings and death of the righteous. The modern problem lies in the unexplained statement of the New Testament that the sufferings and death of the righteous expiate. From this point, Fiebig should have started.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK CITY

J. E. FRAME

Under the title, *Key Words*,¹⁴ Dr. Robertson discusses: "God the Father," "The Son," "Sin," "The Kingdom," "Righteousness," "Holy

¹⁴ *Key Words in the Teaching of Jesus*. By A. T. Robertson, D.D., professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1906. 128 pages.

Spirit," and "Future Life." Professor Robertson's dogmatics have too frequently determined his interpretation. In feeling he is influenced by the idea of the fatherhood of God, but his logic is untouched by it. While asserting that with Jesus "the truth could be turned loose on its own merits without the support of some great name to guarantee its genuineness," he nevertheless distinctly derives the worth of Jesus' message from the divine character and origin of Jesus. And to say that he (Jesus) "was born at all only to die for our sins" seems from any point of view extreme. It would be difficult to use terms more loosely than the author does in his chapter on "The Kingdom." If it represents to him any definite idea, his words fail to indicate what that idea is. In his discussions of "Sin" and "Righteousness," especially the latter, he writes with strength and persuasion. The ethical note is here dominant. For a certain class of readers the book will have a distinct value.

Professor Beecher¹⁵ has given us a serious study, suitable by purpose and execution for lay readers, but not without value for the student. The presentation is fresh, lucid, independent, and in interpretation historical rather than dogmatic. Jesus' distinctive and controlling idea is that of eternal or aeonial life. This begins in the present age and persists into the future age. The terms used to describe it do not connote absolute unendingness but only indefinitely long duration. Eternal punishment is not endless suffering for sin in the present life, but the natural penalty of eternal sinning. The present body will be fitted by change for the habitation of the soul or self in the next world. "Second probation," "conditional immortality," and a general "resurrection judgment" are matters on which a hasty and decisive judgment should not be expressed. They are difficult questions. The book has two serious defects in method. In certain parts of the discussion modern opinions are indicated without expressing any definite decision between them, and what Jesus taught is left to be inferred with little or nothing to guide us in the inference. Also on certain points Paul and other parts of the New Testament are examined and then it is said to be superfluous to adduce proof that they express the teaching of Jesus. The same results might sometimes have been obtained by an examination of Jesus' own teaching; at other times Jesus is quite silent on the point discussed.

J. W. BAILEY

OSHKOSH, WIS.

¹⁵ *The Teaching of Jesus Concerning the Future Life.* By Willis Judson Beecher, D.D. New York: American Tract Society, 1906. 197 pages. \$0.75.